

### REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-15, 17, and 18 are pending.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 16 is canceled herein.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 15 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Tatchell (U.S. 6,160,877). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 6, 15, 17, and 18 have been amended to clarify that the communication terminal has a changeable address, and that the terminal that is requesting connection has identification information that is utilized in determining whether the connection is permitted.

Thus, when an external communication terminal requests to connect to a communication terminal that is connected to a network and has a changeable address, whether the external communication terminal is permitted to connect to the communication terminal is individually determined for each communication terminal. Therefore, the external connection can be respectively controlled according to the preferences of the user of the communication terminal receiving the request. As a result, the present invention provides the benefit of allowing a user to permit a connection only from a specific party, and prevent a connection from an unintended party in advance.

In order to realize these benefits, it is necessary to identify the requesting communication terminal because the addresses of the communication terminals are changeable in the present invention. Since the addresses are changeable, the address is not sufficient for determining that a communication terminal requesting communication is a connection-permitted terminal. Thus, identification information of the requesting terminal is needed.

On the other hand, Tatchell relates to a telephone to which a fixed telephone number is assigned. Also, in Tatchell, "a calling party" corresponding to the second communication terminal in the present invention transmits only a telephone number (akin to a fixed address) of "a subscriber" (akin to the first communication terminal), and does not transmit any information like the identification information as recited in claims 1, 6, 15, 17, and 18.

Tatchell discloses "a personal agent" having the following function. When a telephone

number transmitted from a calling party is any one of a plurality of telephone numbers which have been selected by a subscriber, the personal agent transfers the call from the calling party to a terminal of the telephone number. However, the personal agent uses the fixed addresses, i.e., the telephone numbers, of the calling party and does not disclose or suggest the identification information of the requesting terminal, aside from the address, as recited in claims 1, 6, 15, 17, and 18.

In addition to the above reasons, claims 1, 6, 15, 17, and 18 are not anticipated by Tatchell because each of these claims includes a recitation directed to notifying the requesting terminal of the current address of the terminal to which connection is being requested when connection is to be permitted. Tatchell does not disclose or suggest such a feature. In Tatchell, since the telephone number is a fixed address and is known by the calling party, and in fact was used to initiate the connection, there is no need to notify the requesting terminal of the current address of the terminal to which connection is being requested.

Because of the distinctions discussed above, claims 1-15, 17 and 18 are not anticipated by Tatchell.

Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11-14, 17, and 18 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Numminen (US 2003/0125024). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Tatchell does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of independent claim 1 as discussed in detail above. Claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1. Numminen does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell of the features recited in claim 1. Therefore, no obvious combination of Tatchell and Numminen would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions recited in claims 2 and 3.

Claims 3, 8, and 9 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Numminen and Matsubara (US 2003/0225796). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Tatchell does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of independent claims 1 and 6 as discussed in detail above. Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and claims 8 and 9 depend on claim 6. As discussed above, Numminen does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell of the features

recited in claims 1 and 6. Moreover, Matsubara also does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell and Numminen of the features recited in claims 1 and 6, nor was Matsubara relied on by the Examiner as providing such disclosure. Therefore, no obvious combination of Tatchell, Numminen, and Matsubara would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions recited in claims 3, 8, and 9.

Claim 10 was rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tatchell in view of Numminen and Ando (US 2006/0047624). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Tatchell does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of independent claim 6 as discussed in detail above. Claim 10 ultimately depends on claim 6. As discussed above, Numminen does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell of the features recited in claim 6. Moreover, Ando also does not provide the missing disclosure by Tatchell and Numminen of the features recited in claim 6, nor was Matsubara relied on by the Examiner as providing such disclosure. Therefore, no obvious combination of Tatchell, Numminen, and Matsubara would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions recited in claim 10.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-15, 17, and 18 are allowable over the prior art of record. It is thus also submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Toshihiko MUNETSUGU et al.

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek  
Registration No. 41,471  
Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
October 29, 2007